IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA AUGUSTA DIVISION

| | ORDER | |
|---------------------------|-------|------------|
| | | |
| Respondent. |) | |
| , , |) | |
| EUGENE BRANTLEY, Sheriff, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. | ý | CV 125-011 |
| i outional, | ý | |
| Petitioner, |) | |
| RODNEY TWEEDY, |) | |
| | | |

After a careful, *de novo* review of the file, the Court concurs with the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, to which no objections have been filed. Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge as its opinion, and **DISMISSES** the petition filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 without prejudice.

Further, a state prisoner seeking relief under § 2241 must obtain a certificate of appealability ("COA") before appealing the denial of his application for a writ of habeas corpus. See Sawyer v. Holder, 326 F.3d 1363, 1364 n.3 (11th Cir. 2003) ("[S]tate prisoners proceeding under § 2241 must obtain a COA to appeal.") This Court should grant a COA only if the prisoner makes a "substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). For the reasons set forth in the Report and Recommendation, and in consideration of the standards enunciated in Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 482-84 (2000), Petitioner has failed to make the requisite showing. Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** a COA

in this case. Moreover, because there are no non-frivolous issues to raise on appeal, an appeal would not be taken in good faith, and Petitioner is not entitled to appeal *in forma pauperis*.

See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3).

Upon the foregoing, the Court CLOSES this civil action.

SO ORDERED this July day of March, 2025, at Augusta, Georgia.

HONORABLE J. RANDAL HALL UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

Page 2 of 2